HN

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,840	08/31/2001	James Cooper	088305-0137	8557

7590 01/13/2005

William T. Ellis
FOLEY & LARDNER
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20007-5109

EXAMINER	
PESIN, BORIS M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/942,840	COOPER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Boris Pesin	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 August 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 August 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 08/16/2004.

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 19, and 28 are independent claims. In the Amendment A, Claims 1, 3, 5, 10, 12, 14, 19, 21, 23, and 28 were amended. This action is made Final.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Huang et al. (US 6571245).

In regards to claim 1, Huang teaches a computer implemented method of automatically generating and rendering a custom view including at least two viewlets

from two different applications, the method comprising: receiving a defined activity sequence from a user (i.e. "Within a virtual desktop 1110, a customize icon 1112 is provided that includes the tools available to assist the user in customizing the desktop" Column 14, Line 16), wherein the activity sequence comprises at least two viewlets (i.e. "Window 1130 includes, for example, an icon listing 1132, an item description listing 1134, and a query box 1136." Column 14, Line 40) from two applications (i.e. "the virtual desktop can include objects associated with word processing, spreadsheet, e-mail, and other applications." Column 14, Line 30), respectively, wherein a viewlet represents a coherent set of operations performed by an application; associating the received activity sequence with the user (i.e. "The virtual desktop can be customized in accordance with the needs and preferences of the user." Column 14, Line 6); storing the activity sequence and associated user as a user context in a data store (i.e. "The user information is maintained in a data record that is stored in the file server." Column 2, Line 53); and rendering a custom view to the user based on the stored user context (i.e. "The virtual desktop can be customized in accordance with the needs and preferences of the user." Column 14, Line 6).

In regards to claim 2, Huang teaches a computer implemented method, wherein the step of receiving the activity sequence includes: providing the user with a selection of available applications (i.e. "the virtual desktop can include objects associated with word processing, spreadsheet, e-mail, and other applications." Column 14, Line 30); receiving user selections of applications (i.e. "The user can create, arrange, or delete objects within the desktop as necessary." Column 14, Line 27); providing the user with a

list of viewlets for each of the applications selected by the user (i.e. "Window 1130 includes, for example, an icon listing 1132, an item description listing 1134, and a query box 1136." Column 14, Line 40); and receiving the user selection of viewlets corresponding to the user's selection of applications (i.e. "The user selects an icon to be associated with the selected object. Subsequently, the user is able to activate the object (i.e., launch an application) by clicking on the icon." Column 14, Line 45).

In regards to claim 6, Huang teaches all the limitations of claim 1. He further teaches a computer implemented method according wherein the step of storing the activity sequence as a user context includes storing information related to the user's login to the two applications (i.e. "The first level of security is provided by the use of a secured login process. During the login process, a login window 1210 appears on the web page of the URL site server. Login window 1210 includes fields for the user identification and the user password. The login information is entered by the user and transmitted to the site server where it is compared with the information in a login database." Column 14, Line 66 – Column 15, Line 5).

In regards to claim 7, Huang teaches all the limitations of claim 1. He further teaches a computer implemented method wherein the information related to the user's login to the two applications comprises an access control list (i.e. "The first level of security is provided by the use of a secured login process. During the login process, a login window 1210 appears on the web page of the URL site server. Login window 1210 includes fields for the user identification and the user password. The login information is entered by the user and transmitted to the site server where it is

compared with the information in a login database." Column 14, Line 66 – Column 15, Line 5).

In regards to claim 8, Huang teaches all the limitations of claim 1. He further teaches a computer implemented method, wherein the step of rendering a custom view includes: retrieving the user context for the user (i.e. "A site server initially receives a URL access from a user at a local system. After a successful login, a personal web page of the user is retrieved from a file server and returned to the local system." Column 2, Line 25); extracting viewlets from applications based on user context (i.e. "The web page represents the virtual desktop of the user and includes links for applications available to the user and files accessible by the user. The web page can also include links to personal information of the user." Column 2, Line 30); and generating the custom view using the extracted viewlets and a device context corresponding to the device used for rendering to the user (i.e. "The web page represents the virtual desktop of the user and includes links for applications available to the user and files accessible by the user. The web page can also include links to personal information of the user." Column 2, Line 30).

In regards to claim 9, Huang teaches all the limitations of claim 6. He further teaches a computer implemented method, wherein the step of rendering a custom view further includes: retrieving the user context for the user (i.e. "A site server initially receives a URL access from a user at a local system. After a successful login, a personal web page of the user is retrieved from a file server and returned to the local system." Column 2, Line 25); logging into the two applications based on information

related to the user's login to the two applications stored with the user context (i.e. "A site server initially receives a URL access from a user at a local system. After a successful login, a personal web page of the user is retrieved from a file server and returned to the local system." Column 2, Line 25); upon successful logging in, extracting viewlets from the applications based on retrieved user context (i.e. "The web page represents the virtual desktop of the user and includes links for applications available to the user and files accessible by the user. The web page can also include links to personal information of the user." Column 2, Line 30); and generating the custom view for rendering using the extracted viewlets and a device context corresponding to the device used for rendering to the user (i.e. "The web page represents the virtual desktop of the user and includes links for applications available to the user and files accessible by the user. The web page can also include links to personal information of the user." Column 2, Line 30).

Claim 10 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 11 is in the same context as claim 2; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is in the same context as claim 6; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is in the same context as claim 7; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is in the same context as claim 8; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is in the same context as claim 9; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is in the same context as claim 2; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 24 is in the same context as claim 6; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 25 is in the same context as claim 7; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is in the same context as claim 8; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 27 is in the same context as claim 9; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 28 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 3, 5, 12, 14, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. (US 6571245) in view of Magallanes et al. (US 5925103).

In regards to claim 3, Huang teaches all the limitations of claim 2. Huang further teaches validating user selection of viewlets (i.e. "The user selects an icon to be associated with the selected object. Subsequently, the user is able to activate the object (i.e., launch an application) [and hence validate it] by clicking on the icon." Column 14, Line 45). Huang does not teach a method wherein the step of receiving the activity sequence includes providing suggestions to the user based on the applications selected by the user. Magallanes teaches "The internet access server can keep track

both for accounting purposes the games "rented" by downloading but also can keep track of the games for the purposes of target marketing of new or improved games by providing a suggestion of new or updated games for the user to play." Column 12, Line 29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Huang with the teachings of Magallanes and include a method for providing suggestions with the motivation to give the user choices in order to make the decision easier for the user.

In regards to claim 5, Huang teaches all the limitations of claim 1. He does not teach a computer implemented method wherein the step of receiving the defined activity sequence for a user includes providing suggestions to the user based on a role associated with the user. Magallanes teaches "The internet access server can keep track both for accounting purposes the games "rented" by downloading but also can keep track of the games for the purposes of target marketing of new or improved games by providing a suggestion of new or updated games for the user to play." Column 12, Line 29). By keeping track of the games, Magallanes creates a profile [i.e. role] of the user and is therefore able to send suggestions based on this profile. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Huang with the teachings of Magallanes and include a method for providing suggestions with the motivation to give the user choices in order to make the decision easier for the user.

Claim 12 is in the same context as claim 3; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is in the same context as claim 5; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is in the same context as claim 3; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is in the same context as claim 5; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 4, 13, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. (US 6571245) in view of McGlothlin et al. (US 6512526).

In regards to claim 4, Huang teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Huang does not teach the computer implemented method, wherein the step of receiving the defined activity sequence for a user includes defining the activity sequence based on a role associated with the user. McGlothlin teaches, "The configuration files 220 maintain a profile for each user, for example, under HK_current_user, which includes the details of the desktop layout 210 for the particular user." Column 7, Line 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Huang with the teachings of McGlothlin and include a method to define the activity sequence based on the user's profile with the motivation to give the user a more appropriate layout.

Claim 13 is in the same context as claim 4; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is in the same context as claim 4; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see page 10, filed 08/16/2004, with respect to claims 3, 5, 12, 14, 21, and 23 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 USC 112 first paragraph rejection of 3, 5, 12, 14, 21, and 23 has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments, in regards to the art rejection, filed 08/16/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues:

a. Huang does not disclose "receiving a defined activity sequence from a user, wherein the activity sequence comprises at least two viewlets from two applications, respectively, wherein a viewlet represents a coherent set of operations performed by an application."

b. Prior art does not teach defining an activity sequence based on a role of the user.

In regards to argument (a), the Examiner disagrees with the Applicant. In Huang, the user is able to configure the desktop with many different applications by removing, adding, or editing certain icons on the screen that correspond to the different

applications. These icons represent a coherent set of operations performed by each separate application.

In regards to argument (b), the combination of Huang and McGlothlin teaches defining an activity sequence based on a role of the user.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100